

REMARKS

UPON THE

CASE

OF THE

Episcopal Clergy and those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Considered as to the granting them a Toleration and Indulgence :

IN A

LETTER

From a Freind to a Member of

PARLIAMENT.

Pfal. 63. 11 -- But the Mouth of them that speak Lyes shall be stopped.

Prov. 26. 4. Answer not a Fool according to his Folly, lest thou be like unto him.

Verse 5. Answer a Fool according to his Folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.

Mr. David Dickson. Papists hate nothing in Prelacy but what is Presbyterian, and Presbyterians hate nothing in it, but what is Popish.

EDINBURGH, Printed in the Year 1703.

REMARKS

UPON THE

COAST

OF THE

Islands of the Pacific Ocean, and the
adjacent parts of the North and South
Americas, from the year 1791 to 1800.

BY

JOHN L. BARR



LONDON: Printed by J. BARR, at the British Museum, in the Strand, 1801.

The Author has the honor to acknowledge the
assistance of Mr. J. BARR, who has been
employed in the Museum, and who has been
informed of the progress of the work.

The Author has the honor to acknowledge the
assistance of Mr. J. BARR, who has been
employed in the Museum, and who has been
informed of the progress of the work.

The Author has the honor to acknowledge the
assistance of Mr. J. BARR, who has been
employed in the Museum, and who has been
informed of the progress of the work.

The Author has the honor to acknowledge the
assistance of Mr. J. BARR, who has been
employed in the Museum, and who has been
informed of the progress of the work.

Edinburgh 8. June 1703.

S I R,

I Once supposed the consideration of the Grounds and Reasons, why those of the Episcopal Persuasion cannot Join in Communion with the Established Church, as you have it in the *Appendix* to the *Gentlemen's Letter*, might have been reckoned a sufficient Answer to all that is advanced in the *Case &c.* perswading to a Toleration, and I am still of that Judgment; But in regard I understood the Party entertains that Book with a Fondness, and have Re-printed it: For your compleat satisfaction, and to meet their Vain-boasting, on *Saturday* last I was determined to make, and to set before you these following *Remarks*.

Remark (1.) page 4. This Gentleman is so much for *Toleration*, that taking occasion to tell us how that some of Christs Disciples left Him, he pretends Christ did not only give them free liberty, but also opened a Door to let the *Twelve* go too: Founding this conceit upon that question of our Saviour, *Will ye also leave me*, a strange Comment! Did Christ open a Door to let them go? Then he took off all obligation upon them to stay, and made it lawful for them, to leave Him. For it cannot be pretended, that by opening the Door, external force was taken off, for there was no such constraint upon them, and consequently the former must be meant, or the sense of the expression shall hardly be found. And I am sure Presbyterians found no Door open to them in the 1684, and thereabout when Episcopacy was regnant, to leave the Paroch-Church if they pleased, but they were cruelly persecuted that found themselves obliged to do so.

Rem. (2.) p. 6. He asserts that as in the Body there are many Members, and every one has not the same Office, even so the Lord Jesus Christ in the Edifying of his Body, seems not to have given all the same Office, nor established a perfect parity among the Builders, but made some Apostles.

and some Prophets &c. This Gentleman is very liberal of his Assertions, for as sometimes he asserts what he is neither able, nor so much as attempts to prove, so frequently he asserts what none will deny as here. Who denies but in the Natural Body there are many Members? And who will say that there is a parity among them? Tho' the Expression be pretty odd, or who will deny that Christ hath given several Officers Extraordinary and Ordinary to His Church? And who will assert that Christ established a perfect parity among these Builders of His House? The dissingenuity and bad design of this loose way of speaking, is obvious, whatever disparity there may be between the Members of the Natural Body, if the Head should be compared with the Foot, for example, yet between Members of the same kind there is no disparity, but a perfect equality, are not the Eyes the Foot, the Legs, the Arms &c. of a Man equal and established in perfect parity, the Legs of the Lame are unequal, there is an imparity there indeed, but that is preter-natural, and I am abundantly convinced it is as Anti-scriptural to introduce an imparity or inequality among the Office Bearers of Christs Houle, that are of the same kind, was there any inequality among the Apostles? Had Peter a Supremacy over the rest? Was there any Evangelist or Deacon that a had superiority of Power, over his fellow Brethren? And why there should be any inequality supposed amongst the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments, I do not conceive; But notwithstanding of all this, I do acknowledge there is a comely and beautiful Order, and inequality among the Office-Bearers of different kinds, the Extraordinary Officers having place and dignity above the Ordinary Officers, as the Pastor above the Ruling Elder, and both above the Deacon, among the Ordinary Officers: And as every Pastor is subject to his Brethren, so the lesser Judicatories of our Church, are subject to the greater, in a most comely Order. So that it is plain, whatever influence this Paper may have upon the unthinking multitude, Men of sense and discretion, that have not drunk in a deep prejudice against the Established Church, will loath such juggling and dissingenuous handling of matters.

Rem. (3.) p. 6. 7. Whereas he pretends *Paul* settled *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, and would have the World beleive that they were Bishops of those Churches, and that of the modern Form, pretending likewise that the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, and those of the rest of the Churches, mentioned in the 2^d. and 3^d. Chapters of the *Revelation*, were the same with the Bishops he pleads for. As for *Timothy* and *Titus*, we peremptorly deny that ever the Apostles settled or fixed them in any Church, and we bid open defiance to the World to prove that they did; It is plain that they were Evangelists, and travelled from Church to Church as the

Apostles

(5)

Apostles directed them. He must be a stranger to the Bible, that knows not that these Evangelists are found as frequently in other Churches, as in these where this Gentleman without any shadow of reason, pretends the Apostles settled them. And let none be gulled with what is said in the postscripts of the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, for they are neither Canonical, nor True; It's plain to all who have any acquaintance with Antiquity, that they were not subjoined for several hundred Years after Christ, *Theodoret* being the first that mentions them, and that, but as a part of his own Commentary, nor did they then appear so full as now, there was no word of Bishop in them, this was added by a latter hand, viz. *Oecumenius* who Wrote above a thousand Years after Christ: Yea it is plain from the very Postscripts themselves, that they are of much latter date than the Epistles, for in that to the first of *Timothy*, *Phrygia* is called *Pacatiana*, which was not the name of it till above 300. Years after Christ, when it was conquered by one *Pacatus* a Roman General, and after him called *Pacatiana*, and in the Postscript to *Titus* it is said the Epistle was Writ from *Nicopolis*, which it could not be, since in the Epistle it self, *Paul* speaks of *Nicopolis* a place whither he designed to go and to Winter, and would have *Titus* to attend him there. *Titus* 3. 12. *Come to me to Nicopolis for I have determined there (not here) to winter.* And thus they are not True, but they that would be more fully informed may consult *Prins Unbishops* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, where I dare assure them full satisfaction: For altho the pride and power of Bishops, and those addicted to their way, reached the Ears of that Learned Man, and cut them off, yet there was never found so much Learning and Reason in the Party, as to cut off the Arguments he hath advanced against that Order, and this without any Reproach to the Men, the cause is indeed so bad, that it is not capable of a rational Defence. And as for the Angels of the Church of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, &c. they are not to be understood as single Persons, but as signifying a Collective Body of Ministers, as *Augustine*, *Tatian*, *Perkins*, with many other Learned Commentatours both Antient and Modern, Write; Yea the very context makes this plain, a singular Term is often to be understood Collectively, and there are many words in those Epistles that favour this Interpretation *ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς* to you and to the rest in *Thyatira* &c. And doth he not say to the Angel of *Smyrna*, *the Devil will cast some of you into prison*, there is not one word in all that Book, intimating that these Angels were single Persons, much less such as had power over Presbyters, but to reason this matter a little. I would ask our Author a Question or two, Are not the Churches in these Epistles divided into Lights, and those that receive Light Candel and Candlesticks? Were there not many Presbyters in the Church

Church of *Ephesus*, for example? And seeing that the Church is thus divided into its Lights, and those that received Light, it is ridiculous to imagine that the Presbyters of that Church should not fall under any part of the division, they cannot be reckoned any part of the Candlestick, for they were Lights, and gave Light, and therefore they must be reckoned a part of the Candle or Star of that Church, and seeing the Holy Ghost tells us, that the Star and the Angel of that Church is one and the same thing. I must necessarily conclude as under the name *Star* all the Lights, so under the name *Angel* all the Presbyters or Ministers of the Word of that Church are contain'd, and consequently the Word *Angel* must not be taken as signifying a single Person, but as signifying a Collective Body of Ministers, and therefore our Author's dream is both contrary to Scripture and Reason.

Rem. (4.) p. 7. This Gentleman pretends that from the Apostles times there were *Bishops* in all Churches, and no doubt he would have us to take his word for it; but I beg him pardon, a greater than he hath not only said, but proven the contrary, by Irrefragable Arguments, the Learned Bishop *Stillingfleet* gives us an account of Churches that were Governed from the beginning without Bishops in his *Irenicum*, and the Learned Dr. *Forbes* in his *Irenicum*, gives an account that the Church of the *Albigenses* never had Bishops &c. And to pretend that it is evident from the Epistles of *Ignatius*, there were Bishops of the Modern Form in every Church throughout the whole Catholick Church, is such a base and disingenuous insinuation, that I know not what to think of it. Is there any one word to be found in these Epistles to prove what he here alleges? And yet *Ignatius* is the only Father he particularly Nameth; and altho that Father puts a distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, and that the Name Bishop begun to be appropriated to the Senior Presbyter at that time; yet there is not a Word to prove a Superiority of Office by Divine Right: Yea, that *Ignatius's* Bishop was no more than a Paroch-Minister, his own words abundantly manifest, *Epistle ad Philad*: 'Εν θυσιαστήριον πάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ὑπὸ ἐπισκοπῆς &c. so that according to *Ignatius*, every Communion Table must have a Bishop, every Paroch where the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is Celebrated must have a Bishop, and how much this Form would differ from the present Establishment, seeing with the Apostle, we reckon Bishop and Presbyter reciprocal Terms, and hold every Minister a Bishop in his own Paroch, let the impartial Reader consider. Again *Ignatius* speaking of the Duty of a Bishop in his Epistle to *Polycarp*, if I rightly remember, says the Bishop ought to be acquainted with ever Lad and Last, and the case of their Souls under his Inspection, from which I necessarily conclude a Bishop in the days of *Ignatius*, could not be no other than a Paroch-Minister or Pastor, and that they had not so many People under their Inspection and Jurisdiction, as
some

Some Paroch Ministers in Scotland have otherways it had been impossible to have had that intimate acquaintance with every Lad and Lass that *Ignatius* speaks of, yea *Turretine* observes that *Ignatius* in his Letter ad *Magn.* calls *πρεσβυτηριον* Presbytry and the Government of the Church by it, *χρειται* *νουμεν* the Institution of Christ, but *νιωντικων* *τακτων* a new custom, which began in his time, whereby Bishops were preferred to Presbyters, and I do remember the Learned *Polhib* has the same Observation. All which being considered the Disingenuity of Episcopal Writers is very much to be admired, and their bale treatment of Antiquity, they take what seems to make for them, without taking notice in the least of what makes against them in the Writings of the Fathers; and I am truly sorry that the Learned Dr. *Wake*, who has translated the Epistles of *Ignatius*, with other Monuments of Antiquity, should have brought such a blot upon his Reputation as cannot be removed by saying *Bishops in Ignatius's time, the same with those in England*, as he has done in the Contents of that Book, he might as well have said *Ignatius* had, and exercised a Papal Power and Dignity, over the whole World.

Rem. (5.) page 7. 'Tis somewhat surprizing, This Gentleman should have termed the Glorious Reformation, of the Protestant Churches, a Lamentable Schism. It is much to be doubted, if this Man ought to be reputed a Protestant. I have read Papists, that have spoken more favourably, of the Reformation; And who have blamed the Church of *Rome*, for their Impositions: As much if not more than he doth. Witness *P. P.* His History of the *Council of Trent*. The Reformed Churches cannot be charged with Schism; far less a lamentable one, that hath miserably divided the Western part of the Church: As this Slanderer, of those Eminent, and now Glorified Instruments, and Servants of God, our Reformers, gives out. They only made a just and necessary separation, in Obedience to the Call of God. *Rev. 18. 4. Come out of her my People, that ye be not partakers of her Sins; and that ye receive not of her Plagues.* Our Author's Disrespective Treatment, of our Reformation, is more than sufficient, to forfait his Credit, and ruine his Reputation among Protestants for ever.

Rem. (6) page 8, 9. He pretends, the greatest part of the Western Churches, which found it necessary to separat from the Church of *Rome*, were convinced, that Imparity and Subordination of the Ministers and Pastors of the Church, was of Divine Institution, of absolute necessity for the good of the Church. &c. Give me leave to reckon this among the rest of his gross Mistakes, and to assure him, his confident asserting will not go far with any thinking Man. Yea I positively deny, that any Reformed Church
judged

judged the Episcopacy to be of Divine Right, or of absolute necessity at the Reformation, or to this very Day. A few particular persons in *England*, we have heard of, to assert the Divine Right of Episcopacy of late. I hope the Learned *Le Blanc* may be justly supposed to know the Judgements of the Forreign Churches fully as well as our Author, and yet he asserts in his *Theses de grad. & distinct. Ministr.* p: 501. That all the Reformed Churches and even those of the *Augustine* Confession do unanimously beleive, that there is no distinction by Divine Right between Bishops and Presbyters, that they are the same both In Name and Thing, that the *French* and *Dutch* Churches, and not a few in *England* it self think it dangerous, and not sufficiently agreeable to the Laws of Christ, to admit of Prelats. And although he denies not, but the more general Opinion of the *English* is, that Episcopacy and Presbytry are distinct Offices, yet I do affirm this Conceit is but advanced of late, for Arch Bishop *Cranmer* as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* Reports it, as the Mouth of the higher House of Convocation returned this Answer to the Question given in by the lower House, concerning Bishops and Presbyters, that Bishops and Presbyters were not two Things, but both one Office in the beginning of Christs Religion, *Irenicum* page 392. And in the year 1537. The Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury* and *York*, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, whose Names are all subscribed to their Book, Entituled *The Institution of a Christian Man*, Dedicated to the King, thus determine, *The Truth is, that in the New-Testament, there is no mention made of any degrees of distinctions in orders; but only of Deacons and Ministers, and of Presbys or Bishops, and of those two Orders, that is to say, Presbys, [or Presbyters] and Deacons, Scripture making expresse mention &c.* So that this Opinion is as irreconcilable with the Judgement of the Ancient Convocations in *England*, as it is with some propositions advanced in the Pamphlets, that have passed between the Two Houses, for the Gentlemen of the lower House plead, their power is not subordinate, but co-ordinate to that of the Bishops. And now seeing, This Gentleman hath gone so far beyond bounds, in his account of the Reformed Churches Opinions, with respect to Episcopacy, I expect no will Man beleive one word he speaks, on that Subject, without a proof.

Rem. [7] page 10. This Gentleman gives out, that where there is parity, there is always Prelacy upon the matter, or a continual strife or confusion. Is this designed by him, to throw a Reproach upon all Judicatories, where matters are managed and determined by Judges, Acting in Parity. If so, many flourishing and well ordered States, and Common-wealths in the World, and that well modelled Court of Council and Session, and several other

other Judicatories in this Nation, are Lashed and Reproached by this Gentleman, as well as the Judicatories of this Church, and as much obliged to take him to Task, and chastise him for his Insolency as others. It seems he would have wonderful Alterations in the Government of Church and State, his Argument here either proves nothing at all, or that every cause should be judged by one Monarchical kind of a Man, or at least by a Judicatory, where one Man hath the Authority, and the rest the priviledge of Advising only, or where at least one Man hath a Negative upon all the rest, this is the lowest condescendance that can be expected; And now let me but enquire one Question, if a Paroch Minister in concert with this Monarchical kind of a Man the Bishop may not treat all his Companions, yea and the Truth its self with an unbounded insolence, both in the Pulpit, and in their Judicatories, without the least fear of any check, or controul, Suppose the Bishop to be *Arminian* or *Socinian*, or Popishly affected, and suppose that by concert with him one or two of the Ministers Preach those Errors and Damnable Heresies, and treat his Orthodox Brethren with an unbounded Insolence (to return him his own words) how is it possible to mend the matter, if such an Erroneous and Insolent Man shall be delated to, and brought before the Bishops Court, and altho' there may be an Hundred Ministers in it, and each one of these fully convinced, that the accused Brother had Preached Popery, or denyed the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and treated his Orthodox Brethren, with all Insolence and contempt, and thereupon should give their Unanimous Vote for his Deposition, the Bishop having a Negative, nothing can be done against him, he shall escape scot free, return home to his Charge to propagate his Errors and treat all his Brethren with more insolence and contempt than ever. Yea and there is no help for this, unless a Presbytry be called to chastise the essential disorders of Prelacy, even a company of Church Officers which they call Bishops acting in Parity in a National Council, to censure this Erroneous Bishop, and those Presbyters that are in concert with him. And if a Parity in the highest Judicatories be agreeable to the word of God, and consistent with Peace and Unity, why may it not be so in the Inferior Judicatories, and yet our Adversaries must either acknowledge this, or erect a Pope over the whole Church, [as they do indeed erect a National Pope. For the Bishop Primat hath a Negative upon the National Synod, So that if he be Erroneous or in concert with Ministers one or more that Preach Socinianism or Popery, Tho' the whole Assembly give their Unanimous Vote for the Deposition they cannot be Censured they may return home to their Charge and propagate their Error: Yea the Calling of National Assembly dependeth entirely upon the King's Will and nothing can be proposed and debated there, without his Allowance, so that if

B

the

the King be Popish or Socinian, there remains no hope of an Assembly to correct them: And thus Episcopal Government is Established. Car. 2. Par. 1. Seff. 3. Cap. 5] which our Author seems but too much disposed for, and the Argument he hints at page 9th either proves the necessity of a Pope, or it proves nothing at all: For there he saith that as every particular flock of Christian people needeth a Pastor and a Watchman, so every Flock of Pastors, viz. Presbyters, need a Watchman, viz. a Bishop, to superintend them, and by a Parity of Reason every particular flock of Bishops need an Arch-Bishop, and every particular flock of Arch-Bishops need a Patriarch, and the flock of Patriarchs need a Pope to superintend them, and now I judge we have carried our Author to *Rome*, where we shall leave him to receive a Complement from his Holiness for the profound respect his Arguments pay the Apostolick Chair, and in the mean time we tell him no Erroneous or insolent Brother can so, or so long escape censure under Presbytry where every one is necessarily obliged to submit to, and receive the censure of the whole Body, or Judicatory where he is a Member.

Rem. 8. page 10. I admire the confidence of some late Prelatical Writers, and particularly of this Gentleman in giving out that Episcopacy was established here at the Reformation, and that Superintendents were properly Prelats, and their disengenuity in not considering, and fairly representing in their Writings what is said against this Allegation is unworthy of Disputants. It is well known those Superintendents were appointed for the *interim*, and in that great Indigencie of the Church were obliged to travel up and down and Preach thrice a Week, there being then scarce one to be found for every Paroch that could do so much as read the Scriptures, But more particularly First. The Superintendent had no consecration by imposition of hands to that Work, nor could they have it in the Modern Notion, for our Adversaries will not allow Presbyters to ordain Bishops, nor is it possible that Men can give a power they have not to themselves. 2. The Superintendent was accountable to, and censurable by those over whom they Superintended, and consequently had but a precedency or Moderatorship. Nor is it here to be Alledged, this was a wrong step, for the Question is not whether our Reformers did right or wrong, but whether the Superintendents were Bishops, or not. 3. Others did the Work of Superintendents by Commission from the Assembly for a Year. And it's certain an Inferior Officer cannot do the Work of a Superior Officer, unless he be advanced to the Superior Office; And being advanced he cannot lay down, or surcease the Exercise of that Office. Therefore seeing Presbyters did the Work of a Superintendent for a limited time without being advanced to a Superior Office, and at the time appointed left that Work, and continued fixedly in their particular post,
and

and all this with the Approbation of the Church : It is plain the Work of a Superintendent was not judged the work of a distinct Office, from that of a *Presbyter*. 4. *Gordon Bishop of Galloway*, who Reformed from Popery, tho' he was allowed as a *Pastor*, yet never as a *Bishop*, nor was he the fixed Superintendent in the bounds, but if they had judged the Office of a *Bishop* of Divine Institution they would certainly received him as a *Bishop* as well as a *Pastor*, and allowed to him the performance of those Offices the *Bishops* claim as their Right. And in this tho' we had no more, we may plainly see our Reformers looked upon *Prelacy* as a Limb of Popery, and therefore would no more admit of that, than of other Errors and Corruptions. 5. The Superintendents were never Honoured to be Moderators of the Assembly, which is indeed very remarkable, and a plain demonstration that our Reformers look'd not upon Superintendents as Superior in Office to *Presbyters*. And as the number of well qualified Ministers multiplyed the use of them wore out, and I know no *Presbyterians* in such an Exigence of the Church, but will allow of general Visitors, and such Itinerant Preachers rather than that a qualified *Pastor* should be tyed to one particular post, and the whole Country about left without the Preaching of the Word, or any other provision for their Souls, save the Reading of the Scriptures.

Rem. 9. page 11. It is an unaccountable banter to say By the pride and insolence of some contentious Brethren, Parity was settled in the Year 1580. Whereas it is manifest that proud and contentious Men would rather have used their influence upon their Brethren to get themselves made *Prelats*) as more agreeable to their Ambition, than that they should influence them contrary to their own inclination, and the settled order of the Church (as this Gentleman pretends) to put all their Brethren and to keep them in a Level with themselves. And to date our Disorders from the Establishment of *Presbytry*, at that time as the cause of them, is such an impudent Calumny and Falsehood, and so contrary to all the Records of those times that it is a wonder any Man should venture on it, nay it is manifest we had profound peace in the Church, and that there was not any one Protestant that did in the least Dissent from the Church, or creat the least disturbance upon the account of Church Matters, Yea *King Ja. the 6th.* seem'd so wonderfully well pleased with the beautiful Order, and delightful Harmony of the Church, that in a National Assembly, he found himself obliged Solemnly to Bless GOD for it, and stood not to prefer the *Kirk of Scotland* to that of *England*, or any other Reformed Church in *Europe*, And even after he was in *England*, he highly commended the Order of the *Kirk of Scotland*, for asking the Question, how Errors came to abound in *England*, and how the

Church of *Scotland* was kept free of them, why said he, if any Man broach Error in *Scotland* the Presbytry takes him to task, and if it prove too strong for them the Synod, and if too strong for that, the General Assembly put hand to it, and are sure to pull it up by the Roots, or Words to this purpose. But the true cause and that which gave rise to all our Troubles was undoubtedly this, King *Ja.* the more to Engage the *English* and pave his way to that Throne encroached upon the Assemblies of this Church, and the priviledges thereof, introduced constant Moderators, in all Church-Judicatories, imprisoned, banished, and condemned to death Ministers that would not go along with his Designs contrary to their own Consciences, the settled order of the Church and the standing Laws, brought in the Five Articles of *Perth* by packt Assemblies after that he had called up some three or four Ministers to *England Spotswood* and his fellows, and sent them down Bishops to domineer over their Brethren, yea and the whole Nation by their High-Commission-Courts, and other Engines of Tyranny and Persecution.

Rem. 10. page 11. This Gentleman tells the World that the discontented Factions in the State serving themselves of the Ministry to kindle and blow the fire that destroyed the Peace, and Prosperity of this Island, concurred with them to set up their beloved parity in the year 1638. A multitude of famous witnesses have informed us, and the Records of those Times do abundantly testify That this is a foul and base misrepresentation yea this Authour, for as dexterous as he is, in misrepresenting: the naked truth doth eminently appear in what he hath said, he acknowledges tho inadvertently that the factions of the State concurred with the Ministry to set up their beloved parity, Why then was not Parity or Presbytrie beloved? and Prelacy hated by the then Ministry of *Scotland*, according to our Authour's own words? Yea and seeing the Nation concurred with the Ministry to set up Presbytrie was not that Government then delightful and Prelacy hateful to the Nation? For it cannot be supposed that there could have been such an unanimous concurrence for the plucking up of the one, and the establishing of the other, if it had not been so. Prelacy was ever an unsupportable Grievance to this Nation, never introduced here but by force and violence, nor could it ever be maintained but by persecution and a standing Army. And at that time the Nation finding there was no end of those Evils, every day new Innovations and Impositions were imposed upon them, and particularly a Service-Book, more lib to the Romish Missal, than that of *England*, and a book of Canons composed in *England* by Bishop *Laud* and his complices (which was another Courtesy, that with others of that nature they may improve against the Sovereign Independence

dency of this Nation in due time) the whole nation, Ministers and People were so discontented with Prelacy, and desirous to have presbyterian government reestablished that the King thought fit to gratify them, in this their just desire, by granting a national Assembly where they did cast off that yoke of Prelacy, which his Father was at so much paines and expence to wreath about their necks, and afterwards to establish Presbytry by a law, And I know no faction nor party of the Nobility, Gentry, Ministry or people that did adhere to the Prelats. For if this Gentleman will be pleased to read the Records of these times, and particularly the Learned Dr. *Burnetts* Memoirs of the Dukes of *Hamilton*, he'll find the Bishops were hated, and had made themselves hateful to the Nobility, by their saucy Carriage and Domineering Pride. *Spotswood* forsooth had got himself advanced to the Chancellours Office, and the first Peer of the Nation must come in at his back, Another Bishop had a struggle with the Earl of *Traquair* for the Treasurers Office, and there was scarce any Office of Honour and profit but it was grasped at. Those Bishops had made themselves hateful to the Ministers and People by their disregarding of the Sabbath, and endeavouring to dispose the People to a good likeing of *Arminian* Tenets, and to judge more favourably of Popery and Papists than they had been in ule to do; And thus they fell without being pitied or regrated, but judged deservedly thrown out by all as a company of Ambitious and perfidious Men, having no regard to their Oaths and Promises or Conditions, which with their hands they had signed, and for the breach of which they were not only deposed, but many of them were Excommunicated in the 38. Yea and I do confidently averr, had it not been for the violent Alterations made in the Church with respect to the Government thereof, the imposing of Bishops and other encroachments thereon, this Nation had continued in Peace, without any intestine War, or Persecution upon the account of Religion: Yea and I bid open defiance to any Man to condescend upon any Commotion or Disturbance in this Nation since the year 1596, but was occasioned by Prelacy, and the Evils thereof, either fear'd or felt.

Rem. (11.) p. 11. For what he says of the change of Government at the (happy) Revolution, and the Parliaments putting the Exercise of it in the hands of the Surviving Presbyterian Ministers, that were put from their Charges since the Year 1662, or such as they had or should assume, is somewhat strange. What else could be done? And if this Gentleman would not be offended, I would ask him a Question. If Episcopacy were Re-established (as God forbid) would they not expect that the Parliament should put the Government in the hands of the surviving Bishops, that were turned out at the Revolution, and such as they should assume, or would they put

put the Government into, or continue it in the hands of Presbyterian Ministers whether they should conform, or be assumed, or not? A distinct Answer to this Question will remove the difficulty. And whereas he complains, a great part of the Ministers of the Nation, Legally and Ecclesiastically settled in their Charges, were without being Accused, Conveened, or Judged, for any Fault turned out &c. against which Presbyterian Ministers did not Remonstrate, and all this without any Redress. I never mett with the Man that did approve of the manner and way the People used in turning out the Episcopal Ministers at the Revolution; but considering that those Ministers were settled amongst them by mere force, that the People look'd upon them as the Instruments of all their Trouble and Persecution in the late Reigns, and thus had drunk in a deep prejudice against those Men, they became utterly Intolerable to the Country, and now whither this prejudice was justly or unjustly conceived, I shall not stay to determine, yet the Wisdom of the Nation found that it was impossible for the People to reap any Spiritual Advantage by their Labours, or that the Peace of the Country could be kept if these Men had been sent back; yea and I am perswaded they would not have gone back, tho' the Parliament had sent them, unless an Army had been sent with them to support and secure them: And therefor the Publick Good, especially when the Edification of Souls, is joined with it, must needs overballance the Interests and Advantage of particular Men. And this Gentleman may remember, that by the Act at *Glasgow* a little after the 1660, a great part of the Presbyterian Ministers in the Nation, Legally and Ecclesiastically settled in their Churches, were without being Accused, Conveened, or Judged of any Fault, not only turned out, but violently torn from a People that loved them so dearly, that they could have willingly endured all hardships for them.

Rem. (12.) p. 12. Whereas it is judged by him unaccountable, that Episcopal Ministers should be Censured by the Judicatories of the Established Church. Upon the contrary it would be much more unaccountable to give them a Lawless Liberty, and that they should be lyable to the Trial and Censure of no Ecclesiastical Judicatory for Errors, Scandals, and Negligence; and as for their having Votes, those that are Assumed are admitted to Vote; and I do not understand, that it can be possibly given to those who are not assumed. Did the Bishops allow Presbyterian Ministers to Vote in their Courts, when a Presbyterian Minister was conveened before them: And seeing Episcopal Ministers are not conveened, nor Judged, but for such things as are uncontrovertable, they have no ground to complain, whereas it is known Presbyterian Ministers were Deposed upon the account of their Perswasion by the Bishops, and as they never expected,

so they never dreamed that they should, have a Vote in the Bishops Courts.

R.m. (13.) p. 12. Whereas it is pretended, that in Equity and Justice a Toleration, and Indulgence cannot be denyed, and that they being a sett and order of Men in the Nation, deserve to meet with some regard. For my part I am well satisfied that they should meet with some regard, that such of them as are in want should have a competent Maintainance given them, they behaving themselves quietly without fomenting Divisions in the State, or Schisms in the Church; but that the settled Order of the Church should be broke, the Reins of Discipline should be loosed, and a lamentable Schism and Division in the Church and Nation should be perpetuated and entailed upon Posterity, for a few Episcopal Ministers, is what the Wisdom of the Nation will never think Just and Equal, especially seeing such of them as cannot Join in Worship with the Established Church (if there be any such among them) will not be hindered to Worship God privately in their Families.

Rem. (14.) p. 14. He pretends he hath made the necessity of a Toleration evident already, and I pretend the contrary, yea I am very sure, no Argument advanced by him can perswade any Man that a Toleration is necessary, unless he be already disposed, and designedly endeavours to procure a Toleration as a notable mean for the subversion of the present Establishment: And whereas he subjoins, they are lawfully ordained Ministers of the Gospel, and an obligation lyes on them to Preach the Gospel, and on the Christian Magistrate not to restrain them, while they give due subjection to the higher Powers &c. All this and much more might have been said for those, who were thrown out of their Churches, and violently torn from their People by the Act of *Glasgow*, and even for those, who were laid aside upon the account of the Test: Were they not Ministers of the Gospel, and of this Church &c. Did they not give all due subjection to the higher Powers? Did they not, or were they not all willing to Swear Allegiance to the King? Which if the Episcopal Ministers had done, they had been protected in Churches; and I must still doubt if all the Episcopal Ministers be deeply sensible of an obligation on them to Preach the Gospel, or are much concerned for the good of Souls, seeing they have not chosen to go to desolate corners, or to set up where they pretend People are most addicted to their way, far less in some desolate corners of the High-Lands, tho' some of them have the *Irish* Language; nay it hath been their work to create Divisions, support a party where Churches are well settled, and People disposed to Join with the Established Church, and this only where they could find Persons of Substance, and known disaffection to the Civil
ESta.

Establishment to Support and Maintain them, so that well may it be said of some of them, as the Apostle speaketh, *Rom. 16. 17, 18, Mark them that cause divisions among us, and avoid them, for they serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own bellies.* And whatever this Gentleman may pretend of their not Preaching, or doing any thing tending to Sedition, it is well known that those Meeting-House-Preachers, and their Abettors, stood not to vent bitter Reproaches, evidencing the highest Disaffection to *King William* and *Queen Mary*, and even for Her present Majesty, they signify but little Respect; few if any at all of them, do so much as mention Her in their Prayers to God, but their juggling in this Point is sufficiently Represented in a *Letter to a Member of Parliament*; And what is there said, is not any where denied in their Prints, and therefor we hold as it Confessed, and shall lay no more of it here.

Case
pag. 14.

Rem. (15) First he tells us why their Ministers cannot in Conscience come up to the *Terms of Assumption* into Ministerial Communion. And that First, Because *The Government of the Established Church was never heard of before, an Imparity without a Parallel, so many Ministers having and exercising Power and Jurisdiction, and Lording it over the rest of the Ministers of the Nation*; he means of the Episcopal Persuasion.

To this I Answer, The Government of the Established Church, is the very same it was in the *Ninty Two*, when *Mr. Forbes*, and *Mr. Irvine*, presented an Address signed by them, for themselves, and the Diocess of *Aberdeen*, their Constituents, Expressing a willingness to submit to the Presbyterian Government of the Church as by *Law Established*; as also to sign the *Confession of Faith*, the *larger* and *shorter Catechism*, as containing the Doctrine of the Protestant Religion, and several other Addresses were given in of this Nature, and to the same Effect. And how they come now to assert they cannot in Conscience submit to the Government of the Established Church, I cannot conceive; And to pretend that in it, there is an Imparity without a Parallel, is both Disingenuous and Ridiculous. And as for their Lording it over the rest of the Ministers of the Nation, this is an Impudent Calumny; did they ever Lybel, Conveen, or Censure any one Minister because he was Episcopal in his Persuasion, or because he Dissented from the Established Church: And if any of them have been Censured for Errors, Scandals, Negligence, or Disorders: This ought not to be called a Lording it over them, unless this Scribler would have had a Licentious Liberty granted to those of his Persuasion, to vent what Errors; and to be guilty of what Scandals, and Disorders they please, without the least controul. But then he comes to particulars, and

First

First he tells us they cannot sign the *Westminster Confession* as the *Confession of their Faith*, because it contains Doctrines controverted among Protestants; Pray let him inform us what Doctrines these are, he excepts against; the *Arminian Doctrines*, no doubt, which were condemned by that Famous Synod of *Dort*, as well as by many Ancient Councils and Fathers: It's but too well known, that those of his Party are deeply tainted with those Tenets: And it's good we have got him to acknowledge that those of his Party can't sign the Confession of Faith; Nor is it a sufficient security that he declares they are willing to own the Word of God, and the Ancient Form of Sound Words; by which no doubt he means the *Creed*. The Church of *England* would oblige him to sign their Articles, and every Church hath its own Standard of Doctrine, and why may not this Church engage all that enter into Ministerial Communion to sign the *Confession of Faith*, which is the Form of Sound Words she hath Adopted, but it seems this Gentleman and those of his Party will not come in, unless a latitude be allowed them to poyson the People of God with Errours, and Heresies: They will not give any further security than what *Papists*, *Arminians*, yea and *Socinians* may freely give, for none of these scruple to own the Word of God, and that Ancient Form of Sound Words this Gentleman speaks of.

2. He pretends they cannot in *Conscience* Declare that the Kirk Government is the only Government of the Church in this Kingdom Established by Law. Why, is it not the only Government Established by Law in this Kingdom? Will this Gentleman pretend the Episcopal Government hath still a Legal Establishment here? In a word it is hard to understand what their *Conscience* bogle at, if this be not at the bottom. And as for what he says of Elders Judging the Soundness of Ministers Doctrine in *Judicatories*, if a Worthy Person willing to give satisfaction in other Points, except against this, I doubt not but the Church will yeild it to him.

3. He pretends their Ministers cannot *Preach the Doctrine of the Church*, pray what Doctrine is it Presbyterian Ministers Preach which they cannot? Or if they should not, would be Censured for? And as for the treatment of the Learned Mr. *Lorimer*, it is a sad misrepresentation, he was heartily invited and would have been kindly entertained in the Nation, but being tender and not agreeing with the Country, he could not be prevailed with to stay among us; But is it not surprising, that he should tell, the Church throws out the Lord's Prayer out of their *Publick Devotion*; O impudent malice! Is not the use of the Lords Prayer recommended in our *Directory for Worship*, so Ministers daily use it: Worthy Mr. *Rutherford* in his Plea for *Paul Presbytry* in *Scotland* owns, he and his Brethren used it, and any may use it that will, and the Ministers are so far from engaging those they Receive into Ministerial Communion, not to use the Lords Prayer, that to

my certain knowledge, many Ministers do heartily wish it were more frequently used, tho' I'm confident it is given of our Lord as a *Patern* for Prayer, and not principally as a *Form*, tho' it may be warrantably used as such. Yet they can no more evince, that we are commanded to use these Words precisely when we Pray from that of *Luke*, when ye Pray, *Jay our Father &c.* then I can evince that Ministers are commanded always when they Preach to say *the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand* in exprefs terms from that of *Matthew*, and as ye go Preach, *saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. We must not understand words according to their Sound, but according to their Sense.

4. He pretends the Terms which the Church in their practice exacts of the Episcopal Clergy they cannot comply with, they make them give a Writing Signed by them, Declaring their Grief and Sorrow for having Served under Prelacy, that they own the Kirk Government as now Established. This is a manifest misrepresentation: For tho' some at their Reception have given in such a Writing; Yet it was not demanded of them, nor were there ever any rejected, because they would not give such a Paper. And as for the Act of the Synod of *Lothian*, which he calls an Association, that was a Voluntary Act of their own, for themselves, but cannot be imposed upon those that come to be received into Ministerial Communion, unless a General Assembly so appoint. And it is Ridiculous to insinuat that a Provincial Synod can alter the Terms of Assumption Established by a National Assembly. - 2. He pretends the People cannot Join in Communion with us; And here, before he speaks directly to the point, he expostulats with Presbyterian Ministers, that seeing the Author of the Letter alledges there can be no scruple of Conscience against Church Communion, the Doctrine, Worship, Sacraments and Church Censures, being the same that were professed and performed under the late Prelacy, How come they to Preach with such impudence through the Nation from the Pulpit, that the Gospel had not been Preached to the People for 28. Years. It is a manifest calumny to say Presbyterian Ministers Preached that impudent Lye over the Nation; Nor can it ever preserve his Credit tho' some unwise person had said so much in some corner or other: The miscarriage of one can never be reckoned the deed of all; unless that one had been Delated and Redress Refused.

As for the other Expostulation, How come we to turn them out of their Livings, (*Hinc illa Lachryma!* to give him his own Words &c.) This is of a peice with the rest. Can impudence it self pretend, that any of them has been turned out by any Judicatory since the Revolution, but upon the account of Scandals, Errors, &c. as above said?

And

And to pretend with this Gentleman, that the Ministers of the Church Baptise persons into a certain Sect or Party only, and not into the Catholick Church is most Absurd, and Ridiculous, and stricks as much against all Churches as against this. At Baptism the Ministers oblige the Parents to own, and to engage to bring up their Children in the Faith of the Christian Reformed Religion, contained in the Scriptures, and more summarly comprehended in the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism. Is this a Baptising them into a Sect? Or are we Singular? Doth not every Church take the same Engagements with respect to the Form of Sound Words, they have Adopted? And is there not such a notable and desirable Harmony between our Confession, and those of other Churches, as *England, Holland, Protestant Church of France, &c.* as may make a Man that has not already Forfeit all Credit, and Reputation blush to cast such a Reproach and base Calumny upon the Church of *Scotland*? Eut

Cantabit vacuus, coram latrone, viator.

And as for the Petitions in the Ministers Prayers, which he pretends the People cannot Join with, pray, what are they? I much doubt, if any withdraws upon this score, and will this Man, and those of his Stamp pretend that a Mans presence in Worship necessarily imports his assenting to every Doctrinal proposition that may be advanced, or Petition put up by the Minister. If so, we could not in Conscience Join with any in publick, or private Worship, unless we know before, what he is to Preach or Pray, are we not to expect Men will keep within Rule, and Directories: And if he Extravage, it's his Fault, not the Hearers. It seems this Gentleman will be very sure of the Ministers, and in particular with respect to their Petitions in Prayer, and therefore I hope, he cannot blame the Church to be sure and particular with him, and those of their Stamp, anent their *Orthodoxy*, and not receive them into Ministerial Communion, upon such general securities, as *Papists, Arminians, and Socinians* may freely give.

Another base Calumny this malicious, or at least most uncautious Libeller throws upon the Ministers of the Church is, that it is an ordinary thing with them to Excommunicat from the Lords Table among the worst of Sinners all men of Prelatical Principles who have not repented for it, Yea some such they have made do Publick Fennance [as he terms it] for this Sin. We are to look upon this as another of his odious Calumnies belched out on purpose to prejudge unwary People against the Ministers of the Church, and to keep up a party in opposition to it. Nor will it in least support him that he says this is not to be understood of all of them, for we much doubt, if he can particularly accuse, and prove it against any one Minister, and tho' he should, it is a manifest Falshood, to

say, that this is the prevailing Spirit that Reigns among them: I am sure, I am as well acquaint with their Carriage in this, as many: And I never heard the least insinuation of this nature from them, But if I had considered what this Gentleman says in the 18th. page of the foresaid Book, I might have spared my pains, for there, with one dash he removes all the Scruples that the Ministers, or People of his Perswasion, pretend against joining in Communion with the Established Church; Doth he not there say? That notwithstanding all the Changes that have been in the matter of Church Government; Yet both the Ministers and the People, of the Respective Parties choise to hold Communion with one another before the Year 1666, Now may I not serve him in his own Terms, but to far better purpose, *habemus confitentes reos*, what imaginable ground of scruple can those of the Episcopal perswasion pretend to have now, which they had not before the 1666? Did not Presbyterian Ministers before that time, as well as since use that same manner of Baptism? Take the same Engagements, Preach the same Doctrine? And in a Word perform all Religious Offices after the same manner, and therefore the Ministers and People of the Episcopal perswasion have not the Conscience they had before the 1666. Otherwayes it would not bogle at those things, it so quietly and delightfully agreed with then. But I must presume they have still the same Conscience, and the more Sober and Judicious among them will Judge themselves Disgraced, by this Impudent Mans advancing such Fooleries in their Name.

Rem. (16.) p. 17. He enquires whither Vice and Immorality &c. do abound more in the States of the *United Provinces*, where the Toleration is so General; than in this Nation. *Answer*, Had it not been for the Illegal Practices of the disaffected in *Scotland*, to weaken the Authority of the Established Church; there is no doubt but by the Blessing of God, Impiety and Prophaneness would have been more fully Suppressed: Yea and as it is, Sin was more restrained, and sharply censured in this Church, than in many places in *Christendom*, till of late the disaffected have turned more vigorous, and bold in their Opposition, and Magistrates more slack, in their Assistance. And as for that Company amongst whom Vice and Impiety doth most abound, such as the *God-dam-me's* and *Confound-me's* and the like, Despisers of Gospel-Ordinances, Notorious Drunkards, and avowed Whoremongers, &c. do they pretend to be Presbyterian? Are they not fond of a Toleration? Do not they tell the Ministers of the Established Church, that they are not of their Way; that they hate their Preciseness; that they have Ministers of their own; and thus they despise the censures of the Established Church. Yea, and it is consistent with my knowledge, that
some

some of those Debauchees are kindly received by the Meeting-House-Preachers, and are admitted to partake of the most Solemn and Sacred Ordinances, and thus they are hardened in their Iniquities, and tempted to beleive they may go to Heaven, tho they walk in the way of Wickedness. And whereas this Gentleman enquires if the Presbyterians feared least the Toleration granted by *King James* to them, should be a door opened to all Scandals, Errors, and Destroy Church Discipline, how came they to embrace it. I Answer, Presbyterians found a door opened to all Errors, and Immorality, and the Discipline of the Church quite Destroyed before ever that Toleration was granted, and nothing appeared worthy of Censure, or so much of notice of the then Governours, as Presbyterian Ministers, their Preaching or Praying, and their Peoples joining with them, tho never so privately: all hands were set at work and the strictest searches made to find them out, and to put them to the outmost Severities. as if the cutting them off from being a People, had been judged absolutely necessary: While in the mean time the *God-dam-meets*, and the most notoriously Vile went not only without censure, but were caressed, and employed as the the fittest Instruments, and surest Supports of the beloved Prelacy. And is it not a jest to think that Presbyterian Ministers who Preached at the peril of their Lives, should have given it over, because *King James* told them, they might exercise their Ministry without hazard.

Rem. [17.] p. 18. Whereas he pretends, that those of the Episcopal Perswasion in *Scotland* may be allowed a Toleration, as well as the Dissenters in *England*. Notwithstanding of what has been said on that subject. I suppose he means by the *Gentlemans Letter to a Member of Parliament*, give me leave to differ from him, and to tell him plainly, he shall as soon bring the East and the West together, as make the case of the Dissenters in *England*, and that of those in *Scotland* run parallel; and therefor I shall require of him a particular and formal Answer, to what is advanced in the foresaid *Letter*, holding forth a discrepancy of the Cases. As for what he says of the Toleration in *England*, its being extended to all Parties professing Christianity, Papists excepted, it being known that there are many Parties in that Kingdom, they naturally ballance each other (to give it in the words of a very Judicious Person that has accurately handled this subject in the *Speech without Doors*) and so are not capable to offer any prejudice to the National Church; But in *Scotland* the National Kirk hath but one Rival, and to countenance and Tolerate that, is to give the adverse Party an Invitation and opportunity to try their Skill to undermine and overturn the present Establishment: Again he pretends, that those of his Party have Exhibited the particular Grounds, why they cannot Join with the Established Church

Church. I must crave leave to deny this; It is true, this Gentleman hath attempted it: I am confident he had no Commission from the Party, and therefor has but spoke his own Sentiments.

Rem. [18.] p. 20. He pretends those of the Episcopal Perswasion both Pastors and People are of known peaceable Principles &c. and have given sufficient proof of this under the last Government; It is well he said under the *last* Government, and not under the *late* Government, otherways the World would have laughed him to scorn; Presbyterians in those days, and when his Party was Regnant, had pregnant proofs of the mildness, peaceableness and Christian Forbearance of the Prelats, and their adherents; yea tho I will not deny, but many of the Episcopal Perswasion are peaceable, and gave good evidence of it under the last (*viz. King Williams*) Government, yet I'm confident many of them evidenced a quite contrary disposition, several Episcopal Ministers were actually in *Dundees* Army, many trafficked up and down to induce People to join and support him, and all of them, which I had occasion to speak with in those days, were very concerned for him, and much exalted when they heard of his Success, and I suppose those Thousands that were under his Command, were not rigid Presbyterians; yea its abundantly known, when the Armies of *Britain*, and those of their Allies mett with any Disaster in *Flanders*, that set of Men look'd big and did not a little insult, and when the Church and State appointed Fasts, they were neglected by Men of that stamp, and in some places they kept sumptuous Feasts, and went a Ravelling and Dancing when God called to Humiliation and Mourning.

Rem. [19.] p. 21. It's certain some five or six Ministers returned their hearty thanks to King *James* for his gracious and surprising favour (to keep their own words, which this disingenuous Man has not done) in not only putting a stop to their long sad-Sufferings, but granting the liberty of the publick and peaceable Exercise of their Ministerial Function without any hazard, they had good reason to declare they were of Loyal Principles, and that they will be so, and likeways to entreat that those who promote Disloyal Principles and Practjces might be look'd upon as none of theirs: And it's plain that to this day, the Principles of a certain Company, and their Practjces not being agreeable to the Word of God, nor the Confession of Faith, are hateful to the Presbyterians. And as it cannot be denied, but many Presbyterians had freedom to hear Episcopal Ministers, when they could not have the Mercy to hear one of their own perswasion, so it is manifest, that a vast multitude of them had not freedom and no gentle, nay nor severe Act of Conformity could bring them to it, as this vain Man impudently asserts; How many were forced to leave their Country, and hazard

hazard the loss of all, even upon this score? And would have sooner chosen to dy than to have yeelded compliance, even in that. But to give out that the Presbyterians returned thanks to King *James* for granting a General Toleration is impudence with a witness, there is no such thing in their Address; tho' as I have read our beloved Bishops Addressed the King to thank him for the Liberty granted to the Papists, with such base Sympathy and abject Flattery, that even the Popish King was ashamed of it, as our Author Writes. But to alledge Presbyterian Ministers Preached not against Popery, nor did advertise the People of the danger of it, is but to ruine the Reputation of the Asserter, their Hearers are living Witnesses of the contrary, yea and their Enemies too, and persecutors; Were not some of them Imprisoned and in danger of Death for their Faithfulness and Freedom that way? The Reverend Mr. *Orrock* who then Preached in a Meeting-House in *St. Andrews*, was clapt up for his freedom against Popery and persecute as was beleived by the Arch-primate, which I am the rather inclined to beleive, in regard it was most agreeable to the practice of that great Patron of the Protestant Religion, in Suspending Mr. *Lyon* Minister at *Killmore*, for his freedom against Popery, in a Sermon preached before the Bishop and his Clergy in *St. Andrews*. The Reverend Dr. *Hardie*, ran the highest hazard for his freedom and Faithfulness against Popery, &c.

Rem. [20.] p. 21. He pretends the Episcopal Clergy cannot Join with the Presbyterians, upon the account of the present Government of their Kirk, he denies that they hold the Government of their Church to be Ambulatory. I have told him already, that there is no Protestant Church under Heaven that holds Episcopacy to be of Divine Right, I have told him that the Church of *England* in two solemn Convocations, have declared that there is no difference between Presbyters and Bishops by Divine Appointment, I have also given him a swatch of the Judgement of the Ancients upon that point; And if he will but take pains to read the first Act of the 2d. Sess. of the 1. *Parl.* of *K. Ch.* the 2d. *Anno* 1662. he'll find that even at that time it was held as a Royal Prerogative, and an Inherent Right in the Crown, to order and to dispose of the External Government and Policy of the Church, and that by vertue of this Prerogative, the King and the Estates of Parliament, did actually change the Form of Church Government; and I know no Episcopal Person or Minister in *Scotland* that did in the least deny this Prerogative: And therefor by plain Demonstration they all held, or ought to be reputed to have held the Government of the Church to be Ambulatory, and determinable either way by the King and Estates: And seeing in the Test they swore to Owne and Maintain this

Pre-

Prerogative, I still hold that those who own Her Majesties Authority are obliged to submit to the present Presbyterian Government Established in the Church, seeing the same is Ratified by Her Majesty, and that under the pain of Perjury. Nor will the Act of Council help them in this, seeing they swore that they took that Oath in the true and genuine sense of the words. And it is folly to pretend, that now they have changed their Judgement to the better, what, have they made any new discoveries? have they found out any new Arguments, that were not under consideration before, to engage them to beleive that Episcopacy is of Divine Right? Or have they received some new Revelation for it? I trow not. I hope this Gentleman will not be offended if I tell him those Learned Prelats, whose Judgement in this point I here subjoin, understood the Controversy as fully as he, or any of his party in Britain.

And the first that I shall bring in to confront this Author and to look him out of Countenance, is Dr. Bridges Dean of Salisbury, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford in his Book called the *Supremacy of Christian Princes*, page 359, clears Aetius from the charge of Heresy in this matter, and tells us Jerom who lived in the same age with Epiphanius was of the same Opinion with Aetius, citing Jerom's Words, *Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui Episcopus*, a Bishop and Presbyter is one and the same, and this Bishop farther adds in the foresaid Book, that this was the Judgement of the Ancient Fathers citing Lombard and Durandus he thus sums up the whole, that in Substance, Order, or Character, as they call it, there is no difference between a Priest and a Bishop, that the difference is but of Accidents and Circumstances, that in the primitive times this difference was not known, &c.

The great and excellent Dr. Jewel Bishop of Salisbury, brings in one Mr. Harding, alledging that they which denyed the distinction of a Bishop and Priest, were condemned of Heresy, to which the Learned Prelate Answered, Untruth, for said he, both the Apostle Paul and Jerom, and other good Men, should be condemned of Heresy at this rate, and afterward he taketh notice that Chrysostom saith between a Bishop and Priest in a manner there is no difference, that Jerom saith the Apostle plainly teacheth us, that Bishops and Priests be all one; that Augustine saith what is the Bishop but the first Priest, and that Ambrose saith there is but one Consecration of a Priest and a Bishop, for both of them are Priests, but the Bishop is the first, thus he.

Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity, in the University of Cambridge, takes notice that the Primitive Churches were governed by the common consent of the Presbyters, but afterwards by the Church: And thus

thus argues, if the Apostles had changed the order. then *Jerome* would not have so diligently collected Testimonies out of the Apostles to prove that Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and he enquires wherefore then saith *Jerome* before it was said I am of *Paul* &c. he answers its certain *Jerome* only alludeth to that place of the Apostle, to show that Schisms were the cause of changing the Order afterwards, and adds this remedy was almost worse than the disease, for as at the first one Presbyter was set above the rest and made a Bishop, afterwards one Bishop was preferred before the rest, and this custom at length produced the Pope with his Monarchy. Thus he

The Learned Arch-Bishop *Usher*, both in his Writings and Discourse acknowledged both these Orders to be the same, that the difference was only in degree, that Bishops Ordained as Prebyters, but regulated the Ordination as Bishops, and would not endure to hear the Ordination of the Reformed Churches condemned. In his *Reduction of Episcopacy* printed by Dr. *Bernard*, He proves both by the words of *Paul*, of *Tertullian* and the Order of the Church of *England* that spiritual Jurisdiction belongs to the common Council of Presbyters, in which the Bishop is no more than President, takes notice that this kind of Presbyterial Government had been long discussed in their Church, but addeth that seeing it is still professed every Pastor hath a Right to Rule the Church and to Administer the Discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the restraint of the Exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in the Realm, no Man can doubt but by an other Law of the Land this hinderance may be well removed. Thus he.

The Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath in his *Irenicum* for ever ruined the pretensions of Episcopacy to a *Jus Divinum*, and altho' the Author of the *Case* pretends that he retracted that Book, yet so long as the reason of it is not destroyed I am well enough, for it is upon the reason of the thing, not the Authority of the person (how great so ever) that I depend: And till that Book be undone as well as unsaid, it will remain in full Force and Vertue, for Reason is always the same, tho' Men and their Interests vary.

And our Countrey-Man the Learned Dr. *Burnet* Bishop of *Salisbury*, inferior to none of that order, writeth I do not alledge a Bishop to be a distinct Office from a Presbyter but a different degree of the same Office &c. I acknowledge Bishop and Presbyter to be one and the same Office &c. many others Eminent and Learned may be added, but I conclude with *Tho. Bacon* Preben, of *Cant.* and refugee for Religion in Queen *Mary's* Reign in his Catechism dedicated to both Arch Bishops, he puts the Question. What difference is there betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter, and Answers none at all, their Office is the same, their Authority and Power is one, therefore *Paul* calls Ministers sometimes Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, sometimes Pastors,

Contr
Dur. 1
6. S. 1
de Ecc
Reg. qu
1. C. 1
de notis
Eccl. qu

5.

Reduce
Epist.
page 2
3. 6.

Vind.
the Cl
of Scot
p. 306

sometimes Doctors, thus he. From all which its plain, the Author of the Case, and those of his Opinion concerning Episcopacy, may be justly reckon'd Broachers of New Doctrines, contrary to the Judgement of all Reformed Churches, and of the most eminently Learn'd of their own way: 'Tis also plain, that the bold Insinuations of some Men, against the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination, run contrary to the Sentiments of all Reformed Churches as well, as to the Judgement of those Eminent and Learned Prelates, whose Testimonies we have adduced, and which they have established by the most powerful and convincing Arguments, in their Writings.

But Experience hath taught me, not to expect that the Adversaries of the Established Church, in this Nation, will so much as consider what has been said for the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination, or against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, by Men of their own way, or by Presbyterian Writers. So excellent Disputants are they, that they will hold by the Conclusion, let Men treat the Premises as they will.

Remark. 20. p. 22. 23. As to what he there says against the Gentlemans Letter with respect to the Address of the Episcopal Clergy to the Queen, as also with respect to the unnatural and Calumnious Speeches of some of the Episcopal Meeting-House Preachers, who loaded their Native Country with the horrid Murder of K. C. the first; As also with respect to Her Majesties Promises to maintain and protect the Established Government of the Church, I shall only desire the foresaid Letter may be considered, and compared with those pages of the Case, and I doubt not, but the Impartial Reader will find, the Letter stands entire notwithstanding of what is advanced by our Author.

Rem. 21. p. 24. Our Author falls foul upon the Author of the Essay 'Tis easy to snatch at words, to make a clinch, and to give things an unfuturable turn, to occasion Laughter. But Men must not be scoffed out of their Reason. The Author of the Essay is above his Banter, and his Knowledge in Philosophy, Divinity and other parts of Learning is such, that in my Opinion this Gentleman will do well not to thrust at his Reputation there, lest he ruine his own. And were it not that I know, if the Author of the Essay judge it worthy of his while, he'll chastise him, what he has here said, should have had a more particular consideration.

Rem. 22. p. 25. Our Author takes notice of one singular Argument (as he calls it) in the Country Ministers Letter against Toleration, viz. That the Toleration cannot be granted here, without Encroaching upon the Legal Benefices; and this he alledges is the cause of all that's spoke by Presbyterians against the Toleration: Now to deal plainly, and to give a just account of the well grounded apprehensions of Men: Let our Authour know; that

a Toleration is craved, to make way for the introduction of Episcopacy, and the overturning of the present Establishment. And all this to prepare and dispose the Nation, for receiving the Young Gentleman King James the Eighth, to sway the Royal Scepter, and that upon the first opportunity: And seeing its said, that all the Young Men of the Episcopal persuasion, who present themselves to the *Quondam* Bishops for Ordination, were during K. James's Life, obliged by those Prelates to take the Oath of Allegiance to him; and since his Death they oblige them in like manner to Swear to the pretended K. James the 8th. It must be acknowledged, that all who have any regard to the Protestant Religion, and were concerned in the late happy Revolution, and in the Government since, must needs oppose the Tolerating Men of that Stamp, and under these Engagements, as they would not put all that's dear to them, whether as Men, or as Christians into Eminent hazard, if not certain Ruine. And if I be judged unfair in this, I crave that the Author, and those of his party, may speak plainly and tell us freely; Whether or not that by a Toleration they intend to draw in Episcopacy, and this as a notable mean to dispose this Nation to receive a Popish Successour? But when I consider, that this has been laid before their door in other prints, and they have alwayes waved it; I may take the question as granted: And seeing this is indeed the sense we have of matters, its more just to attribute all the Diligence and Faithfulness of Ministers, whether in Preaching or Writing to this Cause, than to that mean and inconsiderable one insinuated by our Author, viz. a fear lest Episcopal Ministers get into Churches and possess Benefices: But it seems to me, he judges others by himself, which is but a very unfair way of Reckoning; and whether Men of his stamp, or the Ministers of the Establish'd Church, have occasioned the Proverb or confirmed it; *The Holy Ministry is turned into a Trade, by which to gain an easy Living?* Let the World Judge; And whether those, or these, have most made a Merchandise of the Holy Ministry, especially as to their Entry to it? As for his terming the Ministers of the Establish'd Church, *a New Set of Men*, its highly Reflective: I doubt not but our Author is much dissatisfied with that Pious and Christian provision, the Parliament made for those, who at the Appointment of Judicatories of the Church, Preached benorth *Forth*; and yet all thinking Men must acknowledge that it is but just and reasonable, that those who Preach there, should have a Maintenance out of the Stipends; And the Apostle tells us, *that these that serve at the Altar should live by it.*

Rem. 24. page 26. This Gentleman tells us Presbyterians might have spared their terrible forebodings of what Cruelty may be looked for from these of the Episcopal Perswasion &c. Those Apprehensions are just; 'Tis plain that the old Temper and spirit doth still possess them; and they want

nor more but an opportunity, to Reveal all the Cruelties of which Thousands, yet living has seen this Nation a Tragical Scene: and the Spirit of Persecution, being bound up in them by the Chains of Providence these Fourteen Years; If by our Sins we provoke God, to unloose their Bands, they will fall in upon us with more Rage and Fury then ever: And to compare the Government in the Establish'd Church to, or call it an Hierarchical Tyranny, to make the State Truckle under it, and to be Executioners of its Orders, is somewhat odd, and so contrary to the Knowledge and Experience of all Men, that the Repeating is the Refuting of it, as well as the Exposing of the Author. He gives out, The Church forced Men to Swear Covenants against their Conscience; And wou'd make Men beleive that those who refused were persecuted even to Death, and that the Scaffolds were made to Reek, with the Blood of the Nobility, and Gentry, and all this by the Church, and because they cou'd not in Conscience take the Covenant: Is it possible for Man to make a more foul Representation! Can any Man advance any thing upon a worse design? Wou'd he not hereby excite the Passions of Men, and highten the prejudices of some against the Establish'd Church: But I'm confident, no Man of sense will take his Testimony no not upon Oath in this matter: For its plain, that notwithstanding of all his pretensions to Brotherly Love and Charity, Unity and Concord among Christians, he cannot purge himself of Malice, and partial Counsel; Yea and I understand, no Man can be reputed a habile Witness, who has given himself up to vent a Train of Untruths: I am weary in searching out the Falsehoods of his Paper, I shall only tell him, the Church doth not, nor never did, desire any Man to take any Oath, or come under any Obligation contrary to their Consciences. And to insinuate, That the State made the Scaffolds Reek by the Death of any one Man, upon the account that they would not take the Covenant, is so gross that I have no extraordinary name of Ignominy, and an ordinary one I will not give it: But to pretend, that the State was the Executioner of the Churches Orders, in putting any Man to Death, is wonderful: Did ever the Church pass a Sentence of Death or Forfaulture, of Fineing or Confining against any Man? Nay surely: No Man can produce one instancee; and therefore I hope a'l men will be aware, and not take things upon Trust, that that are advanced by this Man, who hath scarce kept within bounds in any one paragraph of his pamphlet: And let this man pretend what he will. I do assert that never Man dyed upon the account of Prelacy, tho' that Idol has had Thousands of Presbyterians sacrificed to it in Scotland, and that angry Ghost (it seems) will not be appeased, until the Scaffold its Altar be erected and made to Reek again: And as has been hinted at before, the foul Reproaches, Misrepresentations, yea and the design of this whole paper; seems to
say,

say, it is but reasonable this Ghost should be thus appeased. I shall now offer a few General Remarks, and so conclude.

Rem. 1. 'Tis plain, Tho' this Gentleman pretends to plead for a Toleration only, he intends to overturn the Establish'd Church, and to introduce Prelacy; And as he is mostly concerned for Prelacy, and the Reintroduction of it; so he hath spent most of his pains in this pamphlet, to dispose to it: Had he intended a Toleration only, to what purpose did he insist so much upon Prelacy? And if he designed not to excite the Parliament to a new Revolution, Why has he so often told them, that Prelacy is of Divine Right; and that the Reformed Churches judge it of absolute necessity, for attaining the great Ends of the Gospel: And this his design is yet the more plain, seeing in the Gentlemans Letter, It is frequently told, and fully proven, that the introduction of Prelacy is intended by those that press for a Toleration: And tho' he pretends (but falsely) that he has particularly considered that Letter (if by considered he means answered) he doth not disown that Design; And how much then his paper encroacheth upon the *Claim of Right* every one may Judge.

Rem. 2. In the whole paper he carries like a Dictator, not a Disputant he tells us Episcopacy is of Divine Right, that *Timothee* and *Titus* were proper Bishops of *Ephesus* and *Crete*: That the Angels of the *Asiatick* Churches were Bishops, That the Reformed Churches judged Episcopacy to be Divine Right and absolute necessity: And all this without the least shadow of either Truth or proof: Yea contrary to the plainest Evidence, and most Authentick Records.

Rem. 3. I have lately seen an *Address*, made by some Presbyterians in *Edinburgh*, and *Canongate* to King *James* upon the Account of the Liberty given by him; To which no doubt our Author had an Eye, when he spoke of *Addressees* upon that occasion: I heartily wish, the publisher of that Address had fixed the Names of the Addressers to it, that I might have informed myself more particularly anent it. It must be owned, that they have been incautious in their Expressions, and seem too much to commend the Declaration in general, which the Five or Six Ministers in their Address to King *James*, on that occasion, have with great Caution and Faithfulness guarded against. Now I am told, the people made their Address, without the Direction or Advice of their Ministers; Yea they were surprised and tricked into it, by one who carried freindly, but was really upon a State-Intrigue, to engage men one way or other, to own the dispensing power; of which (as I am told) some after-practices of his gave plain demonstration. I am likewise told, the most that were prevailed with, to sign that Address, were but Ten or Twelve. And I do assure the Reader, that none of these Addressees

ever

ever had the Approbation of the Ministers and people of *Scotland*: And therefore, whatever is contained in them, concerns only those that signed them.

Rem. 4. This Gentleman pretends, that we dare little trust to the Inclinations of the People, notwithstanding our high pretensions to them: I hope none will deny, but that the Inclinations of the People besouth *Tay* are for Presbytry, and generally so averse from Prelacy, that, that Form of Government is utterly intolerable in these places, and I do confidently avow that benorth *Tay* the Inclinations of the People stand so indifferent to either, That as the Reverend Mr. *Meldrum* in his Printed Sermon, from his own certain personal knowledge hath asserted, they will not stay from their Parish Churches, but attend on Ordinances there dispensed, whether by Presbyterian or Episcopal Ministers; Yea, and I bid open defiance to this Gentleman, or any of his stamp, to condescend upon any Parish settled by a Presbyterian Minister, or supplied by the Appointments of the Church, in any place benorth *Tay*, where the Body of the People doth not join in Worship and partake of all Ordinances dispensed, unless they are restrained by some particular person or other, of known disaffection; yea and for Demonstration of this, there was not an Episcopal Meeting-House in the whole North of *Scotland*, till of late, and before Mr. *Abercrombie* Letter was directed there; except, in the Shire of *Angus*, and even there, there were but two or three, one at *Montross* and another at *Dundee*, and these kept up only out of humour, by persons of avowed disaffection to the Civil Government; when they wanted preaching in the Meeting-Houses, they all joined in Worship in the Churches, a very few particular persons excepted, and even these were led more by humor, than Conscience: And as they have acknowledged to my self, they look upon the Government of the Church to be indifferent, and stood not to own, that if they had been satisfied with the Civil Authority, whereby Presbytry was Established, and Episcopacy Abolished, they would have had no scruple to have joined in Communion with us; and this they own to all that I have conversed with, who have discoursed them upon that subject. The World must not be imposed upon, by the Addresses, the busy Agents of that party have procured, in *Orkney*, *Fife*, and *Glasgow*, it's well known, that in *Orkney*, some persons pretending the Queens Authority conveyed the People, and threatned them with Her Majesties displeasure, assured them that Episcopacy was just now to be Established, That the Bishop when he came among them, would be severe upon those that would not subscribe that Address; yea they went the length, to fine those that would not sign, which, considering how much the People of that Country depended upon the

the Bishop in time of Episcopacy, and that many of them are the Queens Vassals and Tennents, could not but much byass them, contrary to their Inclinations: Yet their success there, was not so great, as might have been expected even among an indifferent People. And as for the unaccountable methods used in *Eise*, such as, their going to Schools, and causing all the Boys sign the Address, forcing Tennents to do the same, without so much as acquainting them with the nature of it, and their procuring the same persons to sign the Address under different Designations, as Lairds of such a place, Burgessees of such a place, as Gentlemen, as Indwellers, &c. so that one Man not only might, but actually did, sign that Address eight times, under different Designations; they are fully exposed in the Account the Presbytry of St. *Andrews* gave to Her Majesties Secretaries of this Business. And as for the Address of *Glasgow*, tho the Author of the Modest and Just Reflexions, hath asserted, that four hundred of the prime Inhabitants of *Glasgow* hath signed such an Address, yet, we bid him open defiance, to name above three or four Families of that disposition in that Town, consisting of above fifteen thousand Inhabitants; and therefore the World may justly wonder, how he came to join such a Title to his Paper, and yet it were pity to forbid them Marriage, seeing the Title and the Pamphlet, are not within the remote degrees of Affinity, or Consanguinity. And now from this account of Matters, which is Modest and just, we may see whether *They*, or *We*, have the best pretensions to the Inclinations of the People; For setting aside all that are Indifferent, and cannot be reckoned on either party, and so cannot have the least ease to Conscience from Toleration, there are a Thousand to One Zealously and from a principle, for the present Establishment.

Rem. 5. I cannot but admire the politicks of those that would introduce a Toleration here, especially considering, the Attempts lately made in the *English* Parliament against these of our Principles there; and yet plead for an Union betwixt the two Nations: They seem to me as Impolitick as Immodest, It's known, that we are very jealous of *English* influence upon the account of the Government of our Church; and it's certain, this Attempt will mightily increase the Jealousy; yea Men are tempted to think, that the Factors for a Toleration in *Scotland*, are in Concert, if they have not a Commission, from these that endeavour to abridge the Dissenters Liberty in *England*, and jointly design to ruine the Presbyterian Interest, both there and here: And therefore inadvertantly frustrate all hopes of an Union. But above all, to frame such a Toleration as may by Law Authorize the use of the *English* Ceremonies and Service Book in *Scotland*, is such a bold stroke, considering that the bringing in those Ceremonies

monies and Service-Book in the Worship of God in *Scotland*, was the cause of that Lamentable Breach between King *Charles* the First and this Nation; and produced the worst Effects, of War and Blood-Shed: as cannot be accounted for, and will undoubtedly prove such a hinderance to the designed Union, as no *Scott Man* can in any Conscience win over.

POSTSCRIPT,

For removing the Dust, the Author of the Case hath raised against the Letter, concerning the Grounds and Reasons, why those of the Prelatical Perswasion cannot join in Communion with the Established Church.

IN the Introduction of his Postscript he pretends his aim in the *Case &c.* was, to give a clear, short, and just representation of the difference &c. And I pretend that my aim in the foregoing paper is to prove his representation of matters, is neither clear, short, nor just. And I am of Opinion that every unprejudiced, and impartial Reader will see that I have obtained my End. 'Tis is plain the Author of the Letter &c. could not approve of the Treatment the Ministers of the Established Church met with from the Authour of the Case, and I can assure you, his wrath and passions were not moved by it, but as I perfectly understand, he read those sheets, and answered that part of them, with a calme and pleasant temper, and smiled to find his Work so easy, and his Antagonist to ruine his Cause, as well as his Reputation, by what he advanced and ye may easily beleive that he is not angry for the First, tho' he may be sorry for the Last, because he could wish every Man would more consult his Credit, Humanity, as well as Religion, being so much concerned in it. And as for the hard Words in that paper he doubts not, but a Man of any Character or Quality might have used them upon the like occasion. He found a private person for his own ends, misrepresenting and uttering the grossest Falshoods against the whole Established Church, yet to show, how condescending he is, I have allowance from him to smooch that Paper, and put it its proper place, among these Sheets, which I have done.

The

The Author of the Case pretended first that Ministers that served under the late Prelacy, could not with a good Conscience come up to the Terms of Ministerial Communion, and that because the Government was never heard of before, an Imparity without a parallel. To which it was Answered First, The Government is the same it was it was in the 92, when Mr. Forbes and Mr. Irvine Addressed for assumption for themselves, And the Diocess of Aberdeen their Constituents, and that several other Addressees of the same nature, from other parts of the Kingdom were laid before that Assembly, and although this be a Matter of Fact, and mainly in force against those that actually concerned in it, yet considering the great number of them, and that in all the Prints I have seen, this Deed of theirs was not condemned, and there being no Remonstrance made by their Brethren against them at the time, it may be look'd upon as a strong presumption, at least, whatever may be pretended now, that the Body of the Episcopal Clergy (as the Author phraseth it) did not look upon it as contrary to Conscience to join with the Established Church, and may we not in this case say; *qui tacet, consensire videtur*: And I must still say to pretend in the Established Church, there is an Imparity without a parallel, is both disingenuous, and Ridiculous, is there any Imparity among Presbyterian Ministers, and as for the Prelatical Ministers of the Nation, so soon as they were received into Ministerial Communion, they were admitted to an equal share of the Government, and how they can either have, or expect to have it, till they be assumed is above my comprehension, But what is said on the Remark upon the 12 page of the Case will afford satisfaction, for tho' our Author repeat, I may be allowed not to follow his example. But to put this matter beyond all controversy know, that at the Reformation, Prelacy was sent a packing, as well as Popery, as we have already cleared the Government of the Church was managed by the Church-Officers acting in Parity, and the first Prelats we had were Consecrate as they term it, and sent from England in the year 1610, Spotswood and his fellows, which were as violently Imposed upon the Church at that time, as they were cheerfully thrown out, in the Year 1638 by a free and lawful Assembly countenanced by Authority, which Established Presbytry with the approbation of the whole Kingdom, and immediatly thereafter Presbytry, this Churches Reformation Right, had its Priviledges and free Exercise restored in one Parliament, and confirmed in another, where King Ch. the 1, was personally present, and thus it continued except, the violent Encroachment made upon it by that Vile Usurper Oliver Cromwel, until the year 1662, when King Charles 2d. Parl. 1. Sess 2. Act. 1. By vertue of his Royal Prerogative, and claiming it as an Inherent Right to the Crown, to order and dispose of the External Government, and Policy

of the Church, did introduce Bishops empowering them to Exercise all Acts of Jurisdiction and Discipline with advice and assistance of such of the Clergy only, as should be of known Loyalty and Prudence; they being always countable to His Majesty. And thus Presbytry suffered a violent Interruption, and Prelacy in a most *Erasian* manner by the Civil Magistrate, without any Ecclesiastick constitution, was crammed down our Throats, and contrary to the Oath and Covenant of God, which King, Parliament Gentry, Ministers Burgeses and Commons, had solemnly entered into, notwithstanding of all which those Ministers who were faithful to God, and made Conscience of their Oath [tho thrown out of their Churches] and also to Exercise Government and Discipline, in which they wanted not the concurrence of Elders, and the submission of a willing People, tho in so doing, they were not only exposed to, but actually underwent the severest Persecutions, until the late happy Revolution (save a short breathing by King *James* his Liberty) when the Estates in their *Claim of Right* declared Prelacy an unsupportable Greivance to the Nation. And the Remanent of the Presbyterian Ministers that had escaped the hands of their Bloody Persecutors and such as they received into Ministerial Communion with themselves having got the free and full Exercise of the Government secured to them in the 1. Sess. of *Parl.* of King *William* and *Queen Mary*. And Presbytry being thus restored to its due and ancient priviledges and Rights, those Presbyterian Ministers began freely, and with ordinar Solemnities to Exercise Government and Discipline in their Judicatories which through the violence of the times they were forced to do but covertly, and in Corners before. And thus its easy to perceive that Presbytry was the first Government Established in this Church, after the Reformation: And consequently those who have fallen from it, or separate upon that account may with far greater reason be reckoned Schismatics, than those who owned and maintained it, and let Men speak or Write what they will, it is a plain Truth, that before the year 60 or 62, there was never a *Scotsman* that alledged Presbyterians were Schismatics, or quarrelled the validity of Presbyterian Ordination: And since the 62 I can observe no just ground for a Charge of such an high nature against Presbyterians. It is an undoubted Truth that the Ministry and the whole Nation had solemnly, and under the form of an Oath renounced Prelacy, and owned and engaged to maintain Presbytry in the Church before that time. And now I would gladly know with what shadow of Reason those Ministers and People, who have proven faithful to God, and made Conscience of their Solemn Oaths and Engagements in cleaving to Presbytry should be reckoned Schismatics, and that those who over the Belly of the most Solemn and sacred Vowes and Engagements did
relapse

relapse, and still cleave unto the more than once abjured Prelacy, should be reckoned the Church:

And it being plain from what I have said that Prelacy from the 62 to the Revolution was nothing else but a Violence and a Rape committed upon the Church by the mere force of the Secular Arm, without her own consent, their Civil Establishment and Secular support failing them, that order and sett of Prelatical Men necessarily fell to the Ground, they having no other Foot to stand upon; The surviving Presbyterian Ministers, and those they had received into a share of the Government with them were the only Society of the Church Officers, that could pretend any Right, Ecclesiastick or Civil to Judge and Censure, to receive into, or cast out of the Church, according to the Gospel Rules; And thus our Authors mighty wonder, and imparity without a parallel, hath vanished into Smoak and Air; And his venting of it serves only to inform the World of the Mismatched Notions he has of matters:

In the 3d. page of his Postscript, Our Author tells us our form of Government is Established by Law, and the Prelatical Clergy must patiently bear with it, *till it please God to move the hearts of Her Majesty, and of the High Court of Parliament, to consider their Grievances; and to remead them, no doubt by overturning the present Establishment, and introducing their beloved Prelacy.* This Gentleman would take care of invading the *Claim of Right* in his Writings, and all unbiaised Men must judge it ill policy that to gratify an Hundred or Two Prelatical Ministers, as many Thoulands and more should be put under insupportable Grievances. It ill becomes him to ask whether Presbyterian Ministers exercised their Power as Deputies from the State, or as Ministers authorized by Jesus Christ. Indeed if the Government of the Church had been established by the King, by vertue of his Royal Prerogative, to order and dispose of the external Government and Policy of the Church: And if Presbyterian Ministers had sworn such an Oath of Supremacy as was required by King *Charles 2.* and were they accountable to the Civil Magistrate for all their Administrations as Head of the Church, and Supreme Judge of all Causes Ecclesiastical and Civil, and from Whom all other Judges and Judicatures Ecclesiastical did derive their Power, they might be well reckoned State Prelates, or Deputes of the Civil Magistrate; and in so far, not Ambassadors of Jesus Christ; which was indeed the Case of Prelatists and Prelatical Government, as is evident by the then standing Laws *Part 1. Sess. 2. Act 1. Sess. 3. Art. 4. Parl. 2. Act 1.* And thus the Prelatical Government was called, and judged, and that most justly *His Majesties Government Ecclesiastical. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Act 1.* So far were they and their Bishops, who sat and Voted to this Act, in the name of the Church from owning Prelacy

cy to be of Divine Right. And seeing the Civil Magistrate doth not now pretend to be Head of the Church, or require any such Oath of Supremacy, but hath Solemnly renounced both, by Act of Parliament. *Parl. 1. Sess. 2. Act. 1. W. and M.* And seeing Presbyterian Church Government, and Church Discipline, that is the Government of the Church by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and General Assemblies is Established upon the foot of the Act of Parliament 1592. Reviving the same, and Rescinding all Acts in so far as contrary to, and inconsistent with the Exercise of the Presbyterian Government now Established *W. and M. Parl. 1. Sess. 2. Ch. 3.* There cannot be the least shadow of Reason for calling the Presbyterian Ministers *State Prelates* or *Deputies of the State*, no more than our Author may call the Christian Faith, or the Scriptures of God, mere state Constitutions. Because the Parliament in their profound Wisdom, have put a Fence about them, an hedge of Penalties, and Civil Sanctions, and therefore as the Ministers in all their Administrations act by virtue of their Commission from Christ, so as Presbyters are they impowered by him to meet, and to judge Presbyters, and to Exercise the power of the Keyes, are we not told the Spirit of the Prophets must be subject to the Prophets and the Presbyters of the Church of *Ephesus* (for so it is in the Original, *Acts 20. 17. μαρτυροῦντες τῇ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, tho it be rendered the *Elders* in our version of the Bible) are charged to take heed to themselves, as well as to the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made them *Bishops* *ἐπισκοπῶν* Verse 28. tho our Translators have rendered it *Overseers* And thus we have the same persons that are called Presbyters in the 17 called Bishops in the 28 Verse of this Chapter by the Apostle, tho the Translators being Prelatical have it seems carefully shunn'd to give them either the Name of Presbyters, or the Name of Bishops as knowing this would look like an Argument against their Cause.

Page 4. Of the Postscript, he will have *Timothy* to be a primitive and Apostolick Bishop, but I beg his pardon, *Timothy* was an extraordinary Officer, an Evangelist, and neither he nor any of his party shall ever be able to prove that *Timothy* was a fixed Officer in any Church. But enough of this already. But then he tells us, if a Man Preach upon those Words, *ye are bought with a Price &c.* He is immediatly charged with Heresy. I do not know what Answer I need to return to this, for I am confident none would believe any such thing that hath the least Acquaintance with the Author, and the freedom he takes in Loading those, whom he intends to blacken. And as for Mr. *Graham*, if he had Injury done him, the Superior Judicatories of the Church Redressed his Greivances. And if those he names with Mr. *Graham* or any other had observed Mr. *Graham's* Measures, the World is bound

bound to believe, if they had been found lesed, Justice would have been done them. So that the Author may be well reckoned calumnious, in loading the Church as he did, without any breach of modesty. The Author of the Letter still thinks he has got advantage by it's being owned that the Prelatical Ministers cannot sign the Confession of Faith, and seeing it has been so frequently told, and particularly in that Letter, that the Party is suspect to be deeply tainted with Arminian Tenents, and consequently highly prejudged against the *Westminster* Confession, and that they still refuse to purge themselves and shift, as here, the suspicion, is like to turn to a Demonstration. And as for what he says of obliging Ministers to sign Forms drawn up by Men, strikes as much against the Church of *England* or any other Church for ought I know, as against the Church of *Scotland*. The Author of the Letter is not mistaken in saying that the Formula containing the grounds of Assumption into Ministerial Communion requires of them that are to be Assumed, that they own and acknowledge the Kirk Government to be the only Government of the Church in this Kingdom, Established by Law, and he appeals to the Formula it self, nor does he in the least doubt, that if a worthy Person willing to give satisfaction in all other Points, excepting against the Ruling Elders Judging of Ministers Doctrine, but he would be condescended to in this. And as he pretends Prelatical Ministers cannot Preach the Doctrine of the Presbyterians. As he was enquired before, so I enquire again, what Doctrine is it Presbyterians Preach, and if he should not, would be *Censured* for? As for the Doctrines contain'd in the *Hind let loose* I am not acquainted with them, and as they have been represented to me, Presbyterians disown them. And I am very sure, whatever may be the Sentiments of Presbyterians concerning the obligations of the Covenant, no Minister has been censured for not Preaching the same, and none can pretend that this is required as a Term of Ministerial Communion, and therefor to speak of these things here is beside the purpose. Then our Author tells us how the Pulpits here thundred against Mr. *Lorimer* was the discourse of all the Nation; In answer to this I still refer him to the Letter, and in the mean time I must tell him that the Common Discourse with respect to what is uttered by the Presbyterian Ministers from the Pulpit is not much to be regarded; why? Was it not confidently said by an Officer of State, that a certain Minister of this City within these few days, had from the *Tron Church* Pulpit uttered these Words? *My Lord Tarbet is cutting the Throat of Presbytry and has taken up the Cudgels against Christ*; yea and this Story was set off with such a seeming certainty, that Ministers were told that a certain Gentleman had written those words from the Ministers mouth, and two Witnesses Names were con-

condescended on, who were in the Church and heard the Sermon, and yet after all, that Noble Lord is so fully convinced of the Falshood of this Story, that he has owned it to the Minister: However this Story has gone to Court to serve a turn there, and no doubt it will be the Discourse of all the Men of that Set in the Nation, and they may impole upon others too; this again may be sufficient to defeat all the idle Stories that pass up and down concerning Ministers Sermons.

P. 6. *Post.* The Author of the Letter still thinks that it is impudent malice to say, the Presbyterians have thrown out the Lords Prayer out of their publick Devotion, and I again referr the Reader to the Letter for satisfaction, and I absolutely refuse that the omitting of the Lords Prayer, is a part of that uniformity of Worship which is required; And seeing some Presbyterian Ministers do use it, and the Directory recommends it, this Gentlemans alledgeance is unjust. He likeways insinuates here, that the Scriptures are not publicly read in the Churches, and yet it is manifest, that the Scriptures are publicly read in all the Churches, a whole Chapter every Lords Day ordinarily, and I hope he will not say, they are not read, because they are also expounded. He falls upon the Lords Prayer again, and tells us that he thought our Saviours commanding us when we pray to say Our Father &c. had been a good warrant for the use of that Divine Form, and I think so too: and so we are agreed. But pray what would our Author be at, does the Church of Scotland pretend that it is unwarrantable to use that Form, I wish God may forgive him for such insinuations. It was told him indeed, tho' he thought fit to take no notice of it, that they can no more evince that we are commanded to use these Words precisely when we pray from that of *Luke*, *when ye pray say our Father &c.* than I can evince that Ministers are commanded always when they Preach; to say *the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*, in express terms from that of *Matthew*, *and as ye go preach saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* The famous instance of our niceness in uniformity in Worship he takes notice of, tho' it were true is not to the purpose, we are treating now of the Terms of Ministerial Communion, and I will not digress. As for what he says of Mr. *Morrison*, who had got a Call to some Church in the Shire of *Bamf.* and his being rejected because he would not sign such a writing. I shall only say, if the Synod of *Aberdeen* required any other engagements of him than the Assembly allows, he might have appealed, and he would have had Justice done him.

P. 7. *Post.* Our Author seems dissatisfied, alledging hard treatment from the Author of the Letter, I shall shortly give an account of the business. In the 16. p. of the *Case*, he had said *how come they* (viz. Presbyterian Mini-

Luke
ii. 17.

Matth.
10. 7.

Ministers) to Preach with such impudence through the Nation from the Pulpit, that the Gospel had not been Preached to the People for 26. Years, the Author of the Letter denyed this Charge as calumnious, adding, *nor can it ever preserve his Credit, tho' some unwise person had said so much in some corner or other; the miscarriage of one can never be reckoned the death of all, unless that one had been delated, and rears refused,* now I'm glad to find the Author brought to his Repentance, and to acknowledge that in saying so he spoke an Untruth, but I must still say, he had never any ground to believe it for a Truth, and I am affraid, he beleived it because he loved to hear the Ministers Reproached. He seems to insinuate that the Author of the Letter grants that a Presbyterian Minister *did so preach in the beginning of the Revolution through many parts of the Nation,* but it's plain from the Letter it self there is no such thing granted, but he must have a liberty to misrepresent; otherways he would have htle to say. He further adds, that seeing now adays Libels are founded upon open Voice and common Fame, the Gentleman should not have been so hard upon him in this matter; I do own that common Fame may rise to that height, as to oblige Judicatories Legally to enquire into the grounds of the Scandalous Report, and this may equally serve for the clearing of the Innocent, as for censuring the Guilty, and stopping the course of Sin, but to Print Men and to expose them to the World upon mere hear say, on purpose to make them Odious, when in the mean time there may not be the least ground for what is said of them, is as far contrary to Humanity as to Religion, and can only be done by those, who are possessed with that Spirit which prompted Men to Write the late *Eloquences*, and can have no other end, but to make Religion and Religious Men, the song of the Drunkard: And the Name of God to be Blasphemed. He will still pretend, that Presbyterian Ministers Baptise into a certain Sect and Party, and not into the Catholick Church, and therefore as was done before, tho' he was resolved to take no notice of it, I set down the Form used on that occasion. At Baptism the Ministers oblige the Parents to own, and bring up their Children *in the Faith of the Christian Reformed Religion, contained in the Scriptures, and more summarly comprehended in the Confession of Faith, the larger and shorter Catechism.* Is this a Baptising into a Sect? or what is there in all this our Author is dissatisfyed with, or that seems to say they do not Baptise into the Catholick Church, is it because it is called the Christian Reformed Faith, whereby they are distinguished from Papists, or is it because it's said to be contained *in the Scriptures* to exclude Traditions, is this the knack; perhaps our Author is not pleased with this Restriction, least the ground of the Divine Right of Episcopacy be excluded; For if it be not to be found

found among the *Traditions*, it is not to be found at all, those that have a Lamb in the Flock, use to be more tender of all the rest. Or is it because it is said the *Christian Reformed Faith* is more summarily comprehended in the *Confession of Faith* than in the *Scriptures*? Why may not this be said? Sure in the 92. Mr. *Irvine*, Mr. *Forbes*, Mr. *Key*, &c. in their Name, and in the Name of a great number of their Constituents, yea and Dr. *Cannaries* who spoke in the Name of the whole party, did not scruple to own the *Confession of Faith*, the larger and shorter *Catechisms*, as containing the *Doctrine of the Protestant Religion* in the face of that Assembly, and how they come to stumble at this now I cannot understand. He pretends it would be a very wilful calumny against Christian Churches, for a Minister to say that the Church of *Scotland* is not singular in this, and that every Church take the same engagements, with respect to the Form of Sound Words, they have Adopted and yet the instances of the Church of *England*, and of the *French*, Protestant Church, in my opinion make against him and not for him. It seems indeed the Church of *England* do not in Baptism expressly mention their Articles, but it is as plain that by our Authors account, that they require their belief of the Apostolik Creed, as well as their engagement to several other particulars, and this is that Form of Sound Words, which that Church hath Adopted for that purpose, and as for the *French* Church, he tells us they bind them to instruct the Child in the Doctrine that is received among the People of God, (by which no doubt they understand their own Confession) and that as it is summarily comprehended in the *Confession of Faith*, and this is the Form of Baptising in the *Dutch* and *Helvetican* Churches, and the Protestants of *Germany*; and thus from his own mouth, tho' contrary to his design, all the Churches he makes mention of take the same engagements with respect to the Form of Sound Words they have Adopted for that purpose in Baptism, that the Church of *Scotland* doth with respect to her Form of Sound Words, and therefor it's far from being a wilful calumny in a Minister to say it. I had almost forgot the deference he payes to the Church of *Rome*, and the care he takes to preserve the validity of her Baptisms, while in the mean time he would make the World believe that those who are Baptised in this Church, are not received into the Catholick Church. I shall not say that there is fibrous between this Gentleman and the Whore of *Rome*, but I may confidently aver that in this he expresses a kindness for her, beyond what he thinks fit to bestow upon us, tho' a true Protestant Church; and this is but sutable indeed to the practice of those, who if a Jesuit turn Protestant, will receive him as a Minister of the Gospel lawfully Ordained, but if a Minister of the *French* Protestant Church, or of any other

other Protestant Church that have not Prelats come in among them, they will not own him as a Minister at all, but plead for his Re-Ordination.

P. 9. Post. As for what he says anent Ministers their Prayers and Preaching, I refer the Reader to what is said in the Letter upon that head for satisfaction. As to his Apology for what he had said in the Case concerning Presbyterian Ministers Excommunicating from the Lords Table, I shall set down his own Words, p. 16. *They (viz. the Prelatists) cannot join with them (viz. the Presbyterians) in the Holy Communion, nor receive it from them, it being an ordinary thing with them to Excommunicate from the Lords Table among the worst of sinners all Men of the Prelatical Principles, ----- yea some such who have been desirous to Communicate with them were not admitted, till they did publick penance for this sin.* The Author of the Letter said p. 18. We are to look upon this as another of his odious calumnies, belched out on purpose to prejudice unwary People against the Ministers of the Church, and to keep up a party in opposition to it, and it will be found he had good reason to call this a calumny advanced by an incautious Libeller, and he is the more confirmed, when he considers the miserable offcome of the Author of the Case p. 9. *Postscript*, for there he tells us *the true occasion of what was said ----- was the relation of a person of known integrity (as he pretends) who gave an instance of the Minister of his own Paroch Covington -----* now in my opinion there are many Persons of such known integrity, and it's like my Lord Secretary lately met with one of them, but I shall not deal narrowly with this Author, was it fair for him to say it was an ordinary thing with Presbyterian Ministers to Excommunicate from the Lords Table among the worst of sinners, all Men of Prelatical Principles, while in the mean time he had only heard of one Minister that did so, and perhaps he was misinformed too, shall ever our Authors word be taken in a matter of Fact, yea or his Oath after this. But I'm glad to accept of Repenance, and I had admitted of his Apology, had I not found him relapsing into the same sin in the very next period of his Postscript. The matter is this. *P. 17. of the Case*, he had said, and as for their Doctrine in many things, he cannot approve it, nor look upon it as the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, but as a mighty condescension, this is not said of all of them, (he adds) but of the prevailing Spirit that reigns among them. The Author of the Letter finding this subjoined in the close of the period, very reasonably judged it had a relation to both, and therefor reckoned it a calumnious Charge, and will still hold it to be a Falshood, to say that it is the prevailing Spirit that reigns among them, to Preach Doctrines in many things that cannot be look'd upon as the Doctrine of Jesus Christ,

And last of all he pretends the Argument the Author of the Letter brings for removing all scruples of Joining with them, from what is said in the 18. P. of the *Case &c.* is not very intelligible. I beg him pardon few will think so, but there are none so ignorant as those that will not understand. The matter is this, in the forementioned place the Author expresseth himself thus, *Notwithstanding of all the changes that have been in the matter of Church Government, yet both the Ministers and the People of the respective Parties chose generally to hold Communion with one another till about the Year 1666.* I'm sure these are his own Words, and they are intelligible too, the Question the Author of the Letter moved upon this is as plain, which was this, *What imaginable ground of scruple then can those of the Episcopal persuasion pretend to have now, which they had not before the 66? did not Presbyterian Ministers before that time, as well as since, use the same Form of Baptism &c. and in a word perform all Religious Offices after the same manner &c?* In my Opinion then, this is very plain and fair dealing, and an Argument that shall not be easily Answered, nor can this be retorted upon the Presbyterians as equally striking against them, who scrupled to hear the Prelatists, for besides their solemn Engagements against Prelacy, their hearing of them was imposed and required, as a test of their Approbation of Prelacy, the words of the Act of Parliament are thus. *And his Majesty doth expect from all his good and dutiful Subjects, a due acknowledgement of, and an hearty compliance with his Majesties Government Ecclesiastical as is now by Law Establish'd within this Kingdom, and that in order thereto they will give their cheerful Concurrence, Countenance, and Assistance to such Ministers as by publick Authority, are or shall be admitted in their severall Parishes, and attend all the ordinary Meetings for Divine Worship in the same; so his Majesty doth Declare that he will, and doth Account withdrawing from, and not keeping and joining in these meetings to be Seditious, and of dangerous Example and Consequence, Cha. 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Art. 1.* Now Men of tender Consciences have been always careful to shun every thing, that might be construed an owning of that which they judged sinful, especially to avoid these things which by Authority, were required of them, as testimonies of their approbation of what they judged sinful. And seeing Presbyterians look'd upon Prelacy as a thing sinful, and found themselves by their solemn Oaths, and Covenants obliged, not only not to own it, but to disown it, and to oppose it, and their joining with Prelatical Ministers being by the abovenamed Act, required of them as an evidence of their Approbation of *his Majesties Government Ecclesiastical*, few of them had any freedom to do it, yea none of them did it, where they could find a Presbyterian Minister to join with, notwithstanding of the outmost hazards they were exposed to, by their so doing. And in this they

evi-

evidenced a true and primitive Christian Spirit, for although in the days of *Julian* the Apostate, Christians as well as others payed a civil respect to the Emperors Picture by bowing to it, as they passed by, yet when that Emperor cunningly and to ensnare Christians placed the Image of his Idol-God beside his own Picture, the Christians refused to pay that Réverence, lest their bowing to the Picture of the Emperor should have been construed, a paying of homage to Idol-Gods.

And to conclude it's plain from this Act made *Anno 1663*, against withdrawing from Prelatical Ministers, that the Author of the *Case* is grossly mistaken in alledging that Presbyterian Ministers, and People, Joined with Prelatists till the 1666. it is certain this Act pre-supposes the woful Schism was stated before the 63, and I date the Schism from the 62, and condescend upon the violent intrusion of Prelats and Prelacy upon this Church, as the true and only cause of it. And therefore that those Prelats and those that adhered to them, and went off from the true Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, contrary to their solemn Oaths and Engagements, were, and are most Natively to be reckoned, the Schismatics.

B I N I S.

74
evidenced a true and genuine spirit for all ought in the day of
Judgment to be accounted Christians as well as others payed a will to the
Emperor's picture by bowing to it, as they called for yet when at the
peter country and to confess Christians placed the image of his idol God
before his own picture, the Christians asked to pay that reverence, but
their bowing to the picture of the Emperor should have been continued,
a paying of homage to idol-Gods.

And to conclude it's plain from this Act made Anno 1684, against
withdrawing from Ecclesiastical that the Author of the Case is
great assistance in obliging the Christian Ministers, and People, John
ed with Ecclesiastical till the 11th, in this Act prescribed the wo-
ful Schism was first before, and I dare the Schism from the 16th
and condemned upon the present situation of Poland and the very upon this
Church, as the true and only one of it. And therefore that those Prelates
and those that adhered to them, and went off from the true reformation
Church of Sweden, contrary to their solemn Oaths and Engagements
were, and are most Necessarily to be reckoned, the Schismatics.



4